Title II of the Higher Education Act
Intuitional Report
APPENDIX C
Annual Institutional Questionnaire on Teacher Preparation:
Academic year: 2000-2001
Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education
Report Year 2: (Fall 2000, Winter, 2001, Summer 2001)

Institution name:	University of Missouri – Saint Louis
Respondent name and title:	Kathleen Haywood, Ph.D., Associate Dean
Respondent phone number:	314-516-5872 — Fax: 314-516-5227
Electronic mail address:	Kathleen_Haywood@umsl.edu
Address:	123 SCCB, College of Education 8001 Natural Bridge Road
City:	St. Louis — State: MO — Zip code: 63121

Section I. Pass rates.

Please provide the information in Tables C1 and C2 on the performance of completers of the teacher preparation program in your institution on teacher certification/licensure assessments used by your state.

Program completers for whom information should be provided are those completing program requirements in the most recent academic year. Thus, for institutional reports due to the state by April 7, 2001, the relevant information is for those completing program requirements in academic year 1999-2000. For purposes of this report, program completers do <u>not</u> include those who have completed an alternative route to certification or licensure as defined by the state.

The assessments to be included are the ones taken by these completers up to 5 years before their completion of program requirements, or up to 3 years afterward. (Please note that in 3 years institutions will report final pass rates that include an update on this cohort of completers; the update will reflect scores reported after the test closure date.) See guide pages 10 and 11.

In cases where a program completer has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test must be used. There must be at least 10 program completers taking the same assessment in an academic year for data on that assessment to be reported; for aggregate or summary data, there must also be at least 10 program completers (although not necessarily taking the same assessment) for data to be reported.

Note: The procedures for developing the information required for these tables are explained in the National Center for Education Statistics document entitled *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act.* Terms and phrases in this questionnaire are defined in the glossary, appendix B of the guide.

Section I. Pass rates.

Table C1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Table C-1	*HEA - Title II 2000-2001 Academic Year*
Institution Name	University of Missouri - Saint Louis
Institution Code	6889
State	Missouri
Number of Program Completers Submitted	397

Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	395				Statewide		
Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Institutional Pass Rate	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate
Professional Knowledge							
Principles of Learning and Teaching (5-9)	523	9			47	47	100%
Academic Content Areas							
Biology: Content Knowledge, Part 1	231	10	10	100%	66	65	98%
Chemistry: Content Knowledge	241	3			15	14	93%
Early Childhood Education	020	38	38	100%	281	280	100%
Education in the Elementary School	010	1			4		
Elem Edu: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	011	155	155	100%	1615	1536	95%
English Lang., Lit. and Comp. : Content Knowledge	041	34	34	100%	205	197	96%
French	170	1			9		
German: Content Knowledge	181	1			2		
Mathematics: Content Knowledge	061	6			105	91	87%
Music Education: Content Knowledge	113	10	10	100%	100	98	98%
Physical Education: Content Knowledge	091	19	19	100%	192	165	86%
Social Studies: Content Knowledge	081	32	32	100%	272	261	96%
Spanish: Content Knowledge	191	3			33	28	85%
Other Content Areas							
Business Education	100	9			69	69	100%
Speech Communication	220	3			26	26	100%
Teaching Special Populations							
Special Education	350	61	61	100%	196	196	100%

Table C2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program							
Table C-2	*HEA - Title II 2000-2001 Academic Year*						
Institution Name	University of Missouri - Saint Louis						
Institution Code	6889						
State	Missouri						
Number of Program Completers Submitted	397						
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	395				Statewide		
Type of Assessment[2]	*Number Taking Assessment[3]*	*Number Passing Assessment[4]*	*Institutional Pass Rate*	*Number Taking Assessment[3]*	*Number Passing Assessment[4]*	*Statewide Pass Rate*	
Aggregate - Basic Skills							

Aggregate - Professional Knowledge	9			53	53	100%
Aggregate - Academic Content Areas (Math, English, Biology, etc.)	313	313	100%	3086	2929	95%
Aggregate - Other Content Areas (Career/Technical Education, Health Educations, etc.)	12	12	100%	165	164	99%
Aggregate - Teaching Special Populations (Special Education, ELS, etc.)	61	61	100%	309	307	99%
Aggregate - Performance Assessments						
Summary Totals and Pass Rates[5]	395	395	100%	3612	3452	96%

[1] The number of program completers found, matched and used in the passing rate calculation will not equal the sum of the column labeled "Number Taking Assessment" since a completer can take more than one assessment.

[2] Institutions and/or States did not require the assessments within an aggregate where data cells are blank.

[3] Number of completers who took one or more tests in a category and within their area of specialization.

[4] Number who passed all tests they took in a category and within their area of specialization.

[5] Summary Totals and Pass Rate: Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the state for licensure and the total pass rate.

Section II. Program information.

A   Number of students in the regular teacher preparation program at your institution:

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation program during academic year 2000-2001, including all areas of specialization.

1.   Total number of students enrolled during 2000-2001: **There were 1428 teacher preparation students enrolled in our program for the Fall 2000 semester and 1325 for the Winter 2001 semester.**

B   Information about supervised student teaching:

2.   How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 2000-2001? **181 in the Fall 2000 semester and 250 in the Winter 2001 semester, for a total of 431 student teachers.**

3.   Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

5 Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: an individual who works full time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

 9 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: any full time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

 19 Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: may be part time university faculty or pre-K-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers do <u>not</u> include K-12 teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint K-12 teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty.

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program. Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 2000-2001: **33**

4. The student/faculty ratio was (divide the total given in B2. by the number given in B3.): **181/29 or 6.5 for the Fall 2000 semester; 250/33 or 7.6 for the Winter 2001 semester.**

5. The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: **30 to 35,** hours. The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is **14 or 16, depending upon the program**. The total number of hours required is **420 to 560 clock hours, depending upon the program (10-12 credit hours, depending upon the program).**

C   Information about state approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs:

6. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state?
    X Yes _____No

7. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state (as per section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)? _____Yes **X** No

NOTE: See appendix A of the guide for the legislative language referring to "low-performing" programs.

Section III. Contextual information (optional).

A. Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s).

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is the land-grant research institution committed to meeting the diverse needs in the state's largest metropolitan community and as such is educating traditional and nontraditional students in undergraduate, graduate and professional programs so that they may provide leadership in health professions; liberal and fine arts; science and technology; and metropolitan affairs such as business, education and public policy.

Academic programs are enriched through advanced technologies and partnerships that link the University of Missouri-St. Louis to institutions and businesses locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. Its special commitment to partnership has provided UM-St. Louis with a leadership role among public educational and cultural institutions in improving the region's quality of life as does its unique relations with two- and four-year colleges and universities in the St. Louis region, which promote seamless educational opportunities.

Based on a comparison of Title II program completers and Core Data records, 252 UM-St. Louis completers are teaching in Missouri public schools, a placement rate of 62%. With the 32 program completers listed above, at least 284 of our program completers are teaching. 402 of our program completers have applied for a Missouri Teaching Certificate (99% of our completers).

Table C1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Table C-1	*HEA - Title II 2000-2001 Academic Year*	
Institution Name	University of Missouri - Saint Louis	Alternative Program Completers
Institution Code	6889	
State	Missouri	
Number of Program Completers Submitted	9	
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	8	**Statewide**

Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Institutional Pass Rate	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate
Professional Knowledge							
Academic Content Areas							
Chemistry: Content Knowledge	241	2			*2*		
Mathematics: Content Knowledge	061	1			*4*		
Physics: Content Knowledge	261	1			*1*		
Other Content Areas							
Technology Education	350	1			*2*		
Teaching Special Populations							
Special Education	350	3			*3*		

Table C2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program

Table C-2	*HEA – Title II 2000-2001 Academic Year*						
Institution Name	University of Missouri - Saint Louis			Alternative Program Completers			
Institution Code	6889						
State	Missouri						
Number of Program Completers Submitted	9						
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations[1]	8			**Statewide**			
Type of Assessment[2]	*Number Taking Assessment[3]*	*Number Passing Assessment[4]*	*Institutional Pass Rate*	*Number Taking Assessment[3]*	*Number Passing Assessment[4]*	*Statewide Pass Rate*	
Aggregate - Basic Skills							
Aggregate - Professional Knowledge				*1*			
Aggregate - Academic Content Areas (Math, English, Biology, etc.)	4			*13*	*13*	*100%*	
Aggregate - Other Content Areas (Career/Technical Education, Health Educations, etc.)	1			*11*	*11*	*100%*	
Aggregate - Teaching Special Populations (Special Education, ELS, etc.)	3			*3*			
Aggregate - Performance Assessments							
Summary Totals and Pass Rates[5]	8			*28*	*28*	*100%*	

[1] The number of program completers found, matched and used in the passing rate calculation will not equal the sum of the column labeled "Number Taking Assessment" since a completer can take more than one assessment.

[2] Institutions and/or States did not require the assessments within an aggregate where data cells are blank.

[3] Number of completers who took one or more tests in a category and within their area of specialization.

[4] Number who passed all tests they took in a category and within their area of specialization.

[5] Summary Totals and Pass Rate: Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the state for licensure and the total pass rate.

B. Missouri has asked each institution to include at least the following information.

1. Institution Mission

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is the land-grant research institution committed to meeting the diverse needs in the state's largest metropolitan community and as such is educating traditional and nontraditional students in undergraduate, graduate and professional programs so that they may provide leadership in health professions; liberal and fine arts; science and technology; and metropolitan affairs such as business, education and public policy.

Academic programs are enriched through advanced technologies and partnerships that link the University of Missouri-St. Louis to institutions and businesses locally, regionally, nationally and internationally. Its special commitment to partnership has provided UM-St. Louis with a leadership role among public educational and cultural institutions in improving the region's quality of life as does its unique relations with two- and four-year colleges and universities in the St. Louis region, which promote seamless educational opportunities.

2. Educational Philosophy

The University of Missouri-St. Louis has a special mission determined by its urban location and its shared land-grant tradition. In addition to the university's comprehensive role as a research university to advance knowledge and understanding, it must work in partnership with other key community institutions to help the St. Louis region progress and prosper. In recent years, however, the diversity of the local and state economies, the complexity of the political and social structures, and the emerging needs of the local community have all exerted pressures on the university toward expanded *communiversity*[1] roles. Thus, through a careful melding of strengths in scholarly research, teaching, and community engagement, the College of Education plays a leadership role in advancing scholarship, and providing quality undergraduate, graduate, and professional instruction for the large numbers of diverse students in the St. Louis area, while also contributing to economic development throughout the state and region. Globalization has brought another kind of pressure to the university. New partnerships go beyond the local neighborhood and St. Louis region. University of Missouri-St. Louis reaches out to other parts of the country and other parts of the world, bringing skills and knowledge to bear on wider problems and bringing back to the campus greater understandings of a rapidly changing world. Faculty in the College of Education see these changes as a natural evolution and growth of the institution, and they support these developments by creating new partnerships and experimenting with new forms of community engagement.

[1] Communiversity model suggests that universities should partner with other agencies and institutions in the community to advance social needs [a praxis or action research model]. Kellogg, 1999.

3. Conceptual Frameworks

In 1997 the College of Education has undertook long-range planning to create the 21st Century College of Education with four themes: 1) learning through field-based experiences, 2) using educational technology, 3) supporting career-long professional development, and 4) collaborating with community partners.

Since learning is situated (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989) within the context of meaningful cultural activity in communities of practice (Wenger, 1998), we want students to be able to make direct connections to those educational contexts. Mediated action (Wertsch, 1998) and dialogue (Bakhtin, 1981) are important and we place an emphasis on developing communities of learners (Brown & Campione, 1994) both within our classrooms and extending to local, national, and international communities.

As a cultural institution fostering and furthering the values and visions of liberal democracy, the College of Education exists within the exigencies, pitfalls, and hopes of democracy and Western individualism. Our goal is to simultaneously value individuals with their idiosyncrasies -- to appreciate the unique needs, abilities, desires, talents, customs, and goals of each person -- while also upholding the commonality of human identity and dignity across communities of local, national, and international scope.

Our desire as a College of Education is to equip teachers and administrators with knowledge and analytic skills enabling them to critique social conditions (Shor & Freire, (1987), language (Derrida, 1976, 1981) and structures of policies (Cherryholmes, 1988; Foster, 1986). Students have multiple opportunities to examine the substance of these issues in some graduate level programs and the new teacher certification program.

The emphasis in education should be to understand subject matter in the context of inquiry; students learn to implement appropriate thinking processes and principles in their respective disciplines. Learning occurs when people are engaged in "inquiry." For faculty members, this takes the form of scholarly activities in teaching, research, and service; for students in higher education, this can take the form of field-based investigations, such as internships in Pre-K to12 professional development schools.

Students build their knowledge and come to understand the world through physical and social means – "making meaning" out of their experiences (Driver & Oldnam, 1986; von Glassersfeld, 1995). Reflection develops through four stages of complexity as knowledge grows through experiences: a) focusing on content knowledge that promotes student understanding, b) applying effective methods, c) sensing the needs of others, and d) enhancing social justice and equity (Zeichner & Liston, 1990). New teachers especially must be prepared to talk about responsibly teaching a diverse population, solving perplexing educational problems, and reflecting on their actions (Valli, 1992). Combining inquiry and reflection processes provides the dynamic for knowledge and understanding of teaching and learning to be developed.

Relationship building and creative problem solving should be modeled by College of Education faculty, as they provide opportunities for reflective apprenticeship learning with partner schools, youth service agencies, cultural institutions, unions, community businesses, and others (Creating the 21st Century College of Education, 1997).

Large teacher preparation programs are challenged to create quality Professional Development School experiences for students because of limited faculty, reliance on adjuncts, and non-traditional student needs. The Metro Cluster model of the College of Eduation brings a set of disparate urban and suburban schools together to encourage partnership sharing across sites (Ambrose et al., 1999; Hovda, 1999; Schmitz et al., 1999). Continuous reflection, dialogue, and improvement is another labor intensive activity that models the professional process we wish our students to internalize in their role as teachers/learners.

Our institution has great potential for impact on the quality of education in the region and state. Compounding this responsibility to our region and state is the fact that most districts, locally and elsewhere, are faced with expanding and increasingly complex demands beyond those traditionally faced by educators. These various constituents look to the UM-St. Louis College of Education for leadership. We must assume the responsibility for leading the way…" (A Plan of Action for the Future, 1997).

4. Program completers who teach in the private schools and out of state

Private Schools:	**25**
Out-of-State:	**4**